APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,377	05/12/2006	David A. Schleppenbach	9405-400-US-4	8224

43218   7590   07/14/2008

TAFT STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 3500
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

EXAMINER
ADESANYA, OLUJIMI A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/14/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

efspatents@sommerbarnard.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 May 2006*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.
      4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *5/12/2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
      Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
      Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
      a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   **Claim 1** is objected to because of the following informalities: "notation a user" in

ln 1 should be "notation to a user" and "P1" in ln 8 should be omitted. Appropriate

correction is required.

Specification

2.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: In particular, **Claim 6** discloses wherein said using a lexicon

step includes drawing from Nemeth Braille Code parameters; **claim 11** discloses

wherein the visual output stream is directed to a display screen.

3.   The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or

other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded

hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 7, 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Raman et al US 5,572,625 ("Raman").

As to **claim 1**, Raman discloses a method of communicating a technical notation to a user, the method comprising the steps of:

converting the notation into data (mathematical expressions, Abstract, col. 4, ln 23-24), inputting the data into a processor to produce inputted data for processing (recognizer, col 4, ln 22-38), said processing including using a lexicon to convert the inputted data into outputted data (lexical analyzer, col 4, ln 22-38), and outputting the outputted data into a format decipherable by the user (audio output, col 4, ln 22-38; col. 1, ln 13-21).

As to **claim 2**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1, wherein at least one code selected from a code group comprising LaTEX, XML, and SGML is used during said converting step (Abstract).

As to **claim 3**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the notation is from a digital file selected from a format group comprising a text file, a Microsoft Word file (word processors, col. 3, ln 7-10), an Adobe Acrobat file, an HTML document, an XML document, an xHTML document, a Quark Express document, a Word Perfect document, an SGML document, and an Adobe PageMaker document that is converted through use of said converting step.

As to **claim 4**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1,

wherein the notation is a printed page that is converted through use of said converting step (col. 3, ln 52-64).

As to **claim 7**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said outputting step includes configuring the outputted data into a format decipherable by the user having print disabilities (Abstract, claim 1).

As to **claim 10**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said outputting step generates a visual output stream for display as an image (Abstract, col. 23, ln 22-24).

As to **claim 11**, Raman discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the visual output stream is directed to at least one from an output stream group comprising a web browser, a document, and a display screen (col. 32, ln 35 – col. 33, ln 27).

As to **claim 12**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1, wherein an audio output stream is generated through use of said outputting step (Abstract).

As to **claim 13**, Raman discloses the method of claim 12, wherein said outputting step utilizes a text-to-speech converter (Synthesizer, Abstract).

As to **claim 14**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said outputting step generates a text output stream (col. 2, ln 65 –col. 3 ln 5)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Raman in view of Kanevsky et al US 6,665,642 B2 ("Kanevsky").

As to **claim 5**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1,

Raman does not explicitly disclose wherein the notation is an audio

source that is converted through use of said converting step.

However, this feature is well known as is evidenced by Kanevsky who

teaches:

wherein the notation is an audio source (col 13, ln 5-18).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to utilize a system wherein the notation is an audio source that is

converted through use of said converting step so as to provide output to hearing-

impaired user (Kanevsky, col 13, ln 5-18)

As to **claim 8**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said

outputting step includes generating a Braille output stream.

Raman does not explicitly discloses wherein said outputting step includes generating a Braille output stream

However, this feature is well known as is evidenced by Kanevsky who teaches:

wherein said outputting step includes generating a Braille output stream

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a system wherein said outputting step includes generating a Braille output stream so as to provide output to a blind or seeing-impaired user (Kanevsky, col. 7, ln 60-63)

As to **claim 9**, Raman discloses the method of claim 8,

Raman does not explicitly discloses wherein the Braille output stream produced through the use of said outputting step is in an output group comprising a display, a web site, a Braille display, and a Braille-printed page

However, this feature is well known as is evidenced by Kanevsky who teaches:

wherein the Braille output stream produced through the use of said outputting step is in an output group comprising a display, a web site, a Braille display, and a Braille-printed page (col. 7, ln 56-63)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a system wherein the Braille output stream produced through the use of said outputting step is in an output group comprising a display, a web

site, a Braille display, and a Braille-printed page so as to provide output to a blind or

seeing-impaired user (Kanevsky, col. 7, ln 60-63)

6.   **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raman in

view of Springer link Publication "Semantics-Based Filtering: Logic Programming's Killer

App?" by Gupta et al ("Gupta").

As to **claim 6**, Raman discloses the method of claim 1 and using a

Lexicon,

Raman does not explicitly discloses wherein said using a lexicon step

includes drawing from Nemeth Braille Code parameters

However, this feature is well known as is evidenced by Gupta who

teaches:

wherein said using a lexicon step includes drawing from Nemeth Braille

Code parameters (sec 3.1, pg 89)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to utilize a system wherein said using a lexicon step includes

drawing from Nemeth Braille Code parameters so as to enable communication between

an instructor and a blind student (Gupta, pg 88, par. 2)

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 5748186, US 6516322.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUJIMI A. ADESANYA whose telephone number is 571-270-3307. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7.30a.m - 5.00p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHEMOND DORVIL can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/OLUJIMI A ADESANYA/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626
/Richemond Dorvil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626